



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

lieve that the law is a just and righteous one. The legal aspects of the measure were all that they had anything to do with, and every one of them might have voted as he did and still hold the act to be an iniquitous one. But it will be difficult for the average mind to distinguish between the legal and moral aspects of the case. It is a puzzle to see how a measure which flagrantly violates a treaty and discriminates so unjustly against one class of foreign residents can be constitutional. This puzzle is made all the more perplexing by the fact that three members of the Supreme Bench, and they of the most eminent, held so emphatically that the law is unconstitutional. If the decision had been unanimous, or nearly so, all suspicion of anti-Chineseism on the part of the other members of the Court would have been removed.

But the Court's judgment settles the question for the present. The Geary measure is a part of the law of the land, of the "revised statutes" of the United States of America, just as the Dred Scott decision was in its day. Any other act of like kind, violating treaties with England, France or any other nation, is declared in advance to be legal. There is no help in the Courts, and a remedy must be sought elsewhere for this disgrace to our civilization. The fact that Congress has not made sufficient appropriation for carrying out the provisions of the law affords, it is true, a temporary relief, but it can not be relied on. When Congress assembles again in the autumn, every Representative and Senator who still abides by his vote in favor of the measure will stultify himself before the country if he does not vote for an appropriation of six millions or more for deporting the Chinese.

The public sentiment of the country must be further aroused. Every Congressman, new or old, ought to be seen at once by the friends of justice and fairness and made to feel, if he does not already, that such legislation is not to be tolerated in a civilized and Christian country. Senator Stanford, of California, has openly avowed his change of opinion on the subject. Many others will doubtless do so when they set themselves seriously to thinking. Unfortunately there is no election of Congressmen this year, and the subject cannot be made a test in an election campaign. Yet something can be done. If the Christian sentiment of the country will only utter itself in the ear of its Representatives and Senators as it has already done in church councils and conferences, the law ought not to stand long on the statute books after the reassembling of Congress.

Whether China will retaliate or not and expel all American residents is still a question. Dr. Baldwin, who was for twenty-two years a missionary in China and long a Secretary of the M. E. Missionary Board, thinks that she will, and that is the fear of all the missionaries in that country. Li Hung Chang, the celebrated viceroy of China, is said to be very angry with the United

States. China has so far been extremely patient towards us, but we must expect that ultimately her forbearance will cease. We sincerely hope that the missionaries may all escape uninjured. They are not participants in the iniquity. They have made a brave protest against it. But they are to a considerable extent at the mercy of the blind fanaticism of the country, which when once aroused makes few discriminations. Retaliation may be the only thing that will bring our country to her senses, but if it comes we pray God that it may be by peaceful means and not by bloodshed and destruction.

If we are to have real peace with China or any other nation, we must treat it in a humane and fair way.

#### DR. DRUMMOND ON THE BOYS' BRIGADE.

During his recent stay in Boston, while delivering a course of lectures on the Evolution of Man, Professor Henry Drummond gave an evening talk at the Clarendon Street Baptist Church, on the subject of the Boys' Brigade. The principal part of the address was taken up with the history of the brigade and an exposition of its purposes and methods. It is unnecessary to say that the address was in the racy and pointed style of which he is a master, and which renders him so attractive to audiences.

The address was full of Professor Drummond's interest in boys, an interest so thorough and genuine that every one feels its reality and sincerity. With this interest in boys we have intense sympathy. We wish every public speaker, every teacher, every preacher, every editor of papers for the young had as much of it. Boys of the age of those for whom the Brigade is intended, both inside of the church and outside of it, have been woefully neglected. They have been treated too much as if they were an intolerable nuisance, to be kept out of the way as far as possible. It is refreshing, therefore, to find a public teacher like Dr. Drummond who has a heart large enough to take in all the boys, however unripe and uncouth they may be. We are sorry, on this account, not to be able to agree with him in his support of the Boys' Brigade. If the institution be what we are convinced that it is in its ultimate tendencies, his eminent support of it is capable of working incalculable mischief, however sincere he may be in his advocacy of it.

In the address alluded to above, he took occasion to refer to the objection made to the Brigade movement by the Peace Societies. This objection is that it tends to make the boys love the pomp and parade of war and hence will necessarily inculcate the military spirit and love of war. Professor Drummond frankly avowed himself a peace man, a member of a peace society, and said that if he thought the Brigade had any tendency to inculcate a war spirit he would have nothing whatever to do with it. But he considered the objection a trivial, an irrelevant, and if we caught the word aright, an "unkind" one.

Why this last word should have been used we do not see. It is certainly not "unkind" to express in plain and courteous language a conviction that has grown out of a careful and conscientious study of any subject. Would Dr. Drummond think it fair if we were to say that it is trivial and unkind in him, a single peace society man, to oppose the opinion of the Brigade held by the Peace Societies and by the friends of peace everywhere, almost without exception? He must know that our objection to the organization is founded, not on mere imagination and whim, not on a mere professional sense of duty as members of peace societies, but on two principles either of which is sufficient to justify strong opposition to the Brigade and to remove any suspicion of unkindness or of triviality on the part of those who object to it. The first of these is the boys' natural tendency to quarrelsomeness and fighting and their love for the pomp and glamour of military life. The Brigade falls in with and strengthens these natural tendencies, instead of opposing them. The second ground of opposition is that habits formed in boyhood become a fixed part of the life and unconsciously shape its course and its choices in after years. It is not the military imagery in the Brigade to which we object. Such imagery when free from all that is essentially military, as in the Salvation Army, is not only harmless, but really useful. This military imagery is much used in the New Testament, but when illustrating and enforcing spiritual truth, it is always pure imagery and nothing more. In the Boys' Brigade, instead of imagery, are found the essentials of militarism,—the gun, the sword, the drill, the camp, and strict military obedience. These boys, who are "deceived" into believing they are soldiers, as Dr. Drummond said in the address, do in this training exactly what those do who are actually preparing for war and fighting. This makes the Brigade as real a war-trap as is the actual uniform and parade ground of the soldier. It is to this essence of military enticement that objection is made, which, if the well established laws of life do not in this case fail to operate, is certain to produce in after years more or less of the military spirit and love of war, and to make it easier to introduce in this country a compulsory military service like the accursed and slavish system of Europe.

Before finishing his address Dr. Drummond, in an effort to keep the Brigade from becoming too military, unwittingly granted the presence in it of the very danger to which we refer. He said that in Scotland they tried to reduce the military elements to a minimum. They did not permit the use of real guns or swords or even uniforms. They used only wooden guns, a fifty cent cap and a twenty-five cent belt, "making a boy for seventy-five cents." He spoke in a criticising way of the real guns and full uniforms which he found in America, as tending to magnify the military side of the organization, at the expense of its Christian purpose. But

why minimize the military elements, if they are not dangerous? And why minimize the gun and uniform elements, and insist on strict military obedience? Why not minimize this latter also, as it is even more dangerous to the moral liberty of a Christian life than the external trappings of war to a just conception of true Christianity. It may be possible in Scotland where the Brigade originated to keep its military side in the background. But that is not possible when the organization spreads abroad and becomes a well developed system, managed by all sorts of church members. The Brigade has sprung into existence in America in full fledged military dress. You could not distinguish a Brigade company on parade from the regular militia. American boys cannot be persuaded to think that they are soldiers by giving them a dummy gun and a cheap cap and belt, and in spite of Dr. Drummond's advice they will go right on wearing brass-buttoned uniforms and carrying real guns.

The inevitable tendencies of the system have already strongly manifested themselves in the development of the movement up to the present time. The cheap Scotch cap and belt have given way to the more expensive uniforms, the wooden guns in many places to real rifles, and as years go on the more serious and dangerous results will appear in their order. The only way to prevent these results is to abandon the movement outright. Neither Dr. Drummond nor any one else can prevent a seed which is watered and nourished from bearing fruit after its kind.

#### COMMITTEE ON RECEPTION OF DELEGATES TO THE WORLD'S PEACE CONGRESS.

The following have been appointed a committee on reception of delegates to the World's Peace Congress. They will look after the comfort and convenience of those attending the Congress, especially of those coming as delegates from foreign nations.

WILLIAM O. McDOWELL, *Chairman*, 20 Spruce Street, Newark, N. J.

#### CHICAGO.

Professor GEORGE N. BOARDMAN, 641 Washington Boulevard.

ALLEN W. FLITCRAFT, 200 Randolph Street.

CHARLES H. HOWARD, Times Building.

Mrs. THOMAS J. LAWRENCE.

Mrs. FREDERICK A. SMITH, Hotel Metropole.

W. B. WICKERSHAM, Chicago Public Library.

#### NEW YORK.

ELIAS H. UNDERHILL, 235 East 27th Street.

Mrs. M. LOUISE THOMAS, Webster Avenue, Fordham.

Mrs. MARY FROST ORMSBY, 115 West 96th Street.

#### WASHINGTON.

Dr. T. A. BLAND. Mrs. BELVA A. LOCKWOOD.

Mrs. MARTHA D. LINCOLN.